REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e) – Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-15, 17, 19-20, 38-40, 42, 44-46, 49-50, and 57-58

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-15, 17, 19-20, 38-40, 42, 44-46, 49-50, and 57-58 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated February 25, 2004 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over the Giobbi patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in order to provide clarification only, claims 1, 5-8, 38, 46, 49-50, and 57-58 have been amended. Claims 1, 5-8, 38, 46, 49-50, and 57-58 are independent claims. Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent claim 1; claims 9-11, 13-15, 17, and 19-20 depend from independent claim 8; and claims 39-40, 42, 44-45 depend from independent claim 38. For brevity, only the bases for the rejection of the independent claims are traversed in detail on the understanding that dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Examiner states "Giobbi discloses a *gaming system comprising a central server and a plurality of terminals (12a-n) remote from and linked to the central server* (10). The terminals (12a-n) comprise screens which display (24a-b) video content for games of chance, such as slots, poker, blackjack, keno and bingo. Due to performance statistics, *the master game server can be configured to automatically modify/download the selection*, content and/or math of games available at the terminals in response to various triggers." (*emphasis added*). However, the Giobbi patent does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, as amended. Specifically, the claimed invention of the present application requires a reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine; while in contrast, the gaming system in the Giobbi patent discloses a central server type of system that is linked to a plurality of remote terminals.

Indeed, the Giobbi patent is entitled "Centralized Gaming System With Modifiable Remote Display Terminals," which teach clearly away from the stand-alone configuration of the

claimed invention. The Abstract and Summary of the Invention section both further explain that the Giobbi patent discloses:

> a central server system and a plurality of display terminals remote from and linked to the central server. The central server system includes a master game server, a game execution server, and a database server. The master game server stores a plurality of games of chance. Each game includes respective game play software and respective audiovisual software. (Page 1, sec [0009]). (*emphasis added*).

In the central server system 10 of the Giobbi patent, the game execution server 16 executes game play software 20b loaded from the master game server 14. The system uses true multi-user procedures so that only one copy of the game play software 20b for that game needs to be loaded. After executing the game play software 20b, the results of the executed game play software are downloaded from the game execution server 16 to the associated remote display terminal 12a. (Page 1, sec [0009]). "The remote display terminal 12 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 22 and memory structure 24." (Page 1, sec [0009]). In the Giobbi patent, a user selects a desired game of chance. This request in then uploaded to the central server system 10 where the audiovisual software 20a is identified and downloaded to the remote display terminal 12 in response to the request from the user. At approximately the same time as the audiovisual software 20a is downloaded to the remote display terminal 12, the associated game play software 20b is loaded onto the game execution server 16 from the master game server 14.

In summary, the Giobbi central server system 10 must be constantly uploading and downloading both game play software 20b and audiovisual software 20a between the master game server 14, the game execution server 16, and the remote display terminals 12a-n. This is a significantly different system configuration and operation than the stand-alone gaming machine of the claimed invention, in which all game content and related processes are retained with the stand-alone gaming machine itself. The Giobbi patent specifically teaches away from this type of configuration due to perceived operational limitations. However, the claimed invention has overcome these perceived operational limitations through the use of its specific component architecture, such as dual processors within each reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine.

The Giobbi patent clearly teaches away from the stand-alone configuration of the claimed invention when it repeatedly touts the benefits of the Giobbi "**central server with remote linked terminals**" model. Specifically, the Giobbi patent teaches that one of the advantages of its "central server/remote terminal" system is that because "games are centrally stored on the master game server 14, a game is easily changed by simply updating the software residing in the master game server." (Page 5, sec [0049]). Thus, the Giobbi patent teaches away from the claimed invention, in which all game content is locally stored in each reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine. Additionally, the Giobbi patent teaches that another advantage of its central server system is that by "buffering the audiovisual software but not the game play software for each game [in each remote display terminal], the remote display terminal may be constructed to have sufficient memory to accommodate the large number of games." (Page 6, sec [0052]). (*emphasis added*). Thus, once again, the Giobbi patent teaches away from the claimed invention, in which all game content is locally stored in each reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine.

Alternatively, the Giobbi patent states that in some embodiments, no buffering of the audiovisual software is performed. (Page 6, sec [0056]). The Giobbi patent further notes, however, that this will result in "a more time-consuming download from the master game server." The patentee also previous stated "after a player at a remote terminal 12 has redeemed any credits remaining on the terminal 12 ... the terminal 12 [remains] idle for a predetermined time ranging from a few seconds to a few minutes...." (Page 6, sec [0056]). Therefore, the central server system of the Giobbi patent also has the disadvantage of the time-consuming downloads from the master game server to the remote terminals. As a stand-alone gaming machine, the claimed invention of the present application does not suffer from these downloading disadvantages.

Lastly, as the Examiner has noted, the Giobbi reference indicates that in an alternate embodiment, "instead of executing the game play software in the game execution server 16, the game play software may be downloaded from the master game server 14 to a requesting remote display terminal 12 and locally executed by the terminal 12." (Page 6, sec [0057]). However, it is important to clarify that in this alternate embodiment, the Giobbi patent only teaches local execution

of game play software, and does not teach local storage of game play software. Indeed, the Giobbi patent actually teaches away from local storage of game play software, as pointed out above (see Page 6, [sec 0052]). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-15, 17, 19-20, 38-40, 42, 44-46, 49-50, and 57-58 as unpatentable over the Giobbi patent has been overcome.

2. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 3, 12, 16, 30-37, 41, 43, 48, and 59

Claims 3, 12, 16, 30-37, 41, 43, 48, and 59 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated February 25, 2004, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giobbi (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107072) in view Takemoto (JP 02001017660A). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in order to provide clarification, claims 1, 8, 30, 38, 46, 48, and 59 have been amended to clarify the invention. Claims 1, 8, 30, 38, 46, 48, and 59 are independent claims. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1; claims 12 and 16 depend from independent claim 8; claims 31-37 depend from independent claim 30; and claims 41 and 43 depend from independent claim 38. For brevity, the bases for the rejection of the independent claims are traversed in detail on the understanding that dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Examiner admits that the Giobbi patent does not teach the use of a plurality of three separate display screens in a reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine. Further, the Examiner also states that the Takemoto patent teaches the use of a third display in a gaming machine. However, upon closer examination, the Takemoto patent actually discloses a single display area that has simply been divided into a first display area 210, a second display area 220, and a third display area 230. Thus, the Takemoto patent merely discloses a single display area that has been subdivided into three sections, but is still part of a single screen. As such, the Takemoto patent does not disclose a triple screen gaming machine in which the three screens can be spaced apart

from each other for such uses as (1) a primary gaming screen, (2) a top glass screen, and (3) a belly glass screen.

Moreover, the shortcomings of the Giobbi patent have been fully discussed above. The Takemoto reference does not resolve any of the Giobbi deficiencies, and thus, claims 3, 12, 16, 30-37, 41, 43, 48, and 59 are patentable for the same reasons as stated above in Section 1. Namely, the Giobbi patent and the Takemoto patent do NOT teach or suggest a reconfigurable stand-alone gaming machine. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 12, 16, 30-37, 41, 43, 48, and 59 as unpatentable has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of Applicant's claims 1-20, 30-46, 48-50, and 57-59 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8319. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 6:30 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/17/04

BROOKE W. QUIST
Reg. No. 45,030
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 712-8300

BWQ:elm